

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by McClasky, U.S. Patent No. 6,343,568. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krikorian, U.S. Patent No. 3,519,292, in view of McClasky. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7-9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krikorian in view of McClasky and further in view of Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,550,731. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krikorian in view of McClasky and further in view of Kim. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krikorian in view of McClasky and further in view of Lurkis et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,343,322. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krikorian in view of McClasky, Lurkis et al. and further in view of Kim. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to provide, in part, that, the arm passing through the interior of the tubular column is “fixedly engaged with at least one of said grooves at a location opposite said hole in such a manner that said arm is prevented from rotating.” Antecedent basis for this amendment to independent claim 1 is found, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 23 of the specification, which was amended by an Amendment filed herein and dated July 17, 2007, (see Amendment dated July 17, 2007, page 4, replacement paragraph for paragraph beginning on page 6, line 23, of the specification, lines 10-16), and in the drawings, for example, in Figs. 11-12.

In contrast to amended claim 1, McClasky uses a pin 48 and spring clip 24 to locate the pin 48 at groove g, (McClasky, column 4, lines 57-58; Fig. 5 from McClasky on page 3 of the

final Office Action). It appears that McClasky nowhere discloses, teaches, or suggests that the pin and the spring clip prevents either the pin or the spring clip from rotating about their central axes.

Similarly, Krikorian discloses a round tubing 24 that engages with a screw threaded fastener 22, (see Fig. 2). It appears that Krikorian nowhere discloses, teaches, or suggests that the round tubing 24 is prevented from rotating about its central axis, in contrast to the arm of independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to further provide that “a tongue is connected to an end of said arm where said arm is fixedly engaged with said at least one of said grooves, said tongue being adapted to engage with said at least one of said grooves.” Antecedent basis for this amendment to claim 1 is found in the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 23, which was amended by the Amendment filed herein and dated July 17, 2007, on page 4 of that Amendment, in lines 10-12 of the paragraph replacing the paragraph beginning at page 6, line 23 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that McClasky does not appear to disclose, teach or suggest a tongue connected to an arm fixedly engaged with a groove where the tongue is adapted to engage with the groove. The groove g alleged by the Examiner to exist in McClasky, (see Office Action, page 2, par. 2), can be seen to be a curved surface in Fig. 5 of McClasky as shown on page 3 of the Office Action. Although the end of what appears to be element 24 appears to be curved, a gap is shown between that end and the surface of the groove g. It is respectfully submitted that such an end is not a tongue adapted to engage with a groove as claimed in independent claim 1. To the extent that element 26 in Krikorian may be construed to be a tongue attached to the alleged arm 24 of Krikorian, (see Office Action, page 4, par. 3, line 5), it is respectfully submitted that element 26 is a threaded member with a flat face at 28 (see Krikorian, column 2, lines 14-15), and such a threaded member with a flat face does not appear to be a tongue adapted to engage with the curved groove g alleged by the Examiner to exist in McClasky.

Since each of claims 3-16 is directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1, each of claims 3-16 is allowable for the same reasons recited above with respect to independent claim 1.

New independent claim 17 has been added. New claim 17 is based upon independent claim 1 before the amendments herein, except that the feature of “a respective portion of a wall

of said at least one tubular column forming each of said external tracks, said respective groove being located in said respective portion of said wall," has been added to the claim and the respective grooves are no longer specified as being adjacent to each of the external tracks. Antecedent basis for new claim 17 is found in the drawings, for example, in Fig. 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1 and 3-17 is respectfully requested.

EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE

Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail to Addressee (mail label # EV889349180US) in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 10, 2008

DOROTHY JENKINS

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence


Signature

January 10, 2008

Date of Signature

RCF/MIM:gl


Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700